

U.S. Serial No. 10/795,996

IIP-5047

REMARKS

The Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-12 remain pending.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reams, U.S. 6,438,660 (Reams) in view of Beaukema et al., U.S. 2003/0093625 (Beaukema). The Applicant traverses as follows.

An important distinguishing feature of the invention that is believed to have been reflected in the claims, but is now set forth more clearly in the claims, is the block nature of the write data that is written by the data control unit from cache memory to the disk drive. The importance is significant because the write data is controlled block-by-block by the data control unit by adding a safety or security code to the data when the block of data at a destination storage area of the disk drive that is a write destination of the write data, and the serial data read from the storage area of the disk drive and temporarily stored in the cache memory, are different.

The primary reference to Reams does not disclose a data control unit for transferring in block units write data to a

U.S. Serial No. 10/795,996

IIP-5047

disk drive or disk array device as claimed. Rather, Reams is directed generally to a memory controller that seeks to ensure cache coherency in a computer system. Accordingly, Reams does not address the concept of transferring data between a cache and a disk drive as claimed.

The secondary reference to Beaukema is cited as teaching the generation of a security code based on the serial data stored in a data storage unit, and adding the generated security code to the serial data. However, Beaukema does not disclose the features noted above that are missing from Reams, and thus even in combination with Reams, Beaukema does not disclose the invention.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 12 are apparently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reams in view of Beaukema, the Office Action citing Reams as disclosing serial write data that is serially received by a data receiver "not necessarily" being transferred to successive areas of a block in the order in which the data is received. However, these dependent claims inherit the patentable features of the respective independent claims, and thus are patentable at least for the reasons advanced above.

04-27-'06 17:41 FROM-Mattingly, Stanger

703-684-1157

T-960 P021/022 F-947

**BLANK PAGE**

U.S. Serial No. 10/795,996

IIP-5047

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846  
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: April 27, 2006